

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

THURSDAY, MAY 20, 1999

CORONADO, CALIFORNIA

REPORTED BY: Nancy A. Lee, CSR No. 3870

1 ATTENDANCE :

2

3 Bill Collins

4 Richard Mach

5 Carla Fargo

6 John Locke

7 Laura Hunter

8 Debbie Wankier

9 Sandor Kaupp

10 Foster Marshall

11 Bob Logan

12 Larry McCauley

13 Tracy Mogg

14 Marilyn Field

15 Stephanie Kaupp

16 Mark Bonsavage

17 Jennifer Rich

18 Stephan Dirladian

19 Rich Wong

20 Kathryn Parker

21 Bruce Willett

22

23

24

25

1 CORONADO, CA., THURSDAY, MAY 20, 1999, 6:35 P.M.

2

3 MR. COLLINS: I'd like to bring the RAB
4 meeting to order. Thanks, everybody, for coming.

5 Tonight the RAB is going to discuss,
6 other than the approval of the minutes from March
7 and April, we're going to talk about the Federal
8 Facility Site Remediation Agreement, the Site 5
9 Monitored Natural Attenuation Study that was done
10 and the Time Critical Removal Action -- we're going
11 to follow-up on that; and an update on Site 9 with
12 the soil vapor extraction steam injection project;
13 and then scoot back to me, and we'll have a
14 presentation on the Interim Measures Assessment/
15 Current Conditions Report; and an update on the
16 Community Relations Plan; and we'll finish out the
17 meeting as normal then.

18 At this time I'd like to go over the
19 minutes for March 31st and see if we can get those
20 approved.

21 MR. MACH: I recall that the last time we
22 looked at the March meeting minutes, Charles had one
23 quick comment, but because they had been sent out so
24 late, everyone voted to put off the approval to this
25 month.

1 MS. FARGO: I do have comments. I've looked
2 at them. I just can't find them. Give me a second.

3 Does anybody else have any comments?

4 MR. COLLINS: Should they halt the approval?

5 MS. FARGO: Let's just move on. Would it be
6 appropriate if I have things, I can maybe -- I
7 can't really add them once we've approved them, can
8 I. I'm sorry.

9 MS. HUNTER: Do you want to wait until the
10 end of the meeting and you can find your comments?

11 MS. FARGO: Would you mind doing that?

12 MR. COLLINS: We can do that.

13 In that case, let's move on to the
14 minutes for the April 21 meeting.

15 MS. RICH: I have a comment.

16 In reviewing them, I just noticed that
17 page 3 that there were responses to Laura's
18 questions but the questions aren't actually there,
19 so I would suggest maybe attaching the questions or
20 actually have the questions put on here.

21 MR. MACH: None of the questions were written
22 in the minutes at all for any of them. There were
23 so many questions, the decision was made to just put
24 in the responses; and then if you want to go through
25 and see all the detailed questions, you can read the

1 transcript, because the transcript is put in the
2 library. Everyone can get a copy of that.

3 We're trying to keep the minutes
4 somewhat brief and trying not to get over four
5 pages, and it would have doubled them to eight pages
6 to put all the questions in.

7 MS. FARGO: Laura, did you get a full copy of
8 the transcript --

9 MS. HUNTER: I did not.

10 MS. FARGO: -- because I probably didn't ask
11 the right questions, but I suggest that we forward
12 the full text up to you since it had both your
13 questions and the answers.

14 Who would get that transcript to Laura?

15 MS. WANKIER: It looks like both days are
16 available, December 1st and 2nd.

17 MR. MACH: I can get her a copy of it. We
18 normally get the transcript from Nancy to Debbie and
19 then Debbie gets it to me, but for that particular
20 one I can get you a copy of it.

21 MS. FARGO: And we'll just do an extra one
22 for Laura.

23 MS. RICH: And does it say somewhere in here
24 that that decision was made as far as the questions?

25 MR. MACH: I don't know.

1 MS. RICH: I don't remember seeing it, but I
2 just thought it would be nice if it just stated
3 somewhere that we didn't put the questions in there.

4 MR. COLLINS: Why don't we have that entered,
5 and then we can tackle the May minutes the next time
6 we meet to approve them. We can have a statement
7 placed in there that --

8 MS. HUNTER: I guess the four page -- I
9 understand why you're trying to keep the minutes to
10 a small number of pages; on the other hand, we want
11 it to be useful and make sense. So maybe in this
12 special case we could put the questions in and the
13 responses so that somebody reading that, it would
14 make sense in context; otherwise, it's not that
15 valuable or attach the relevant pages -- something
16 so that people don't have to go hunting around to
17 try to get information.

18 I think just the answers without the
19 questions -- I haven't read them, so I don't know.

20 MRS. KAUPP: Maybe a way to solve the problem
21 is to do them back to back instead of single pages.

22 MR. COLLINS: Oh, print them double sided.
23 Does anyone --

24 MR. MACH: Well, generally the minutes are
25 supposed to be double sided anyway, and we were

1 trying to keep it to four pages of text. If you
2 want the questions in there, we can revise them and
3 put the questions in.

4 MS. HUNTER: Maybe in this case it makes more
5 sense so when you're reading them, you know what
6 you're looking at.

7 MR. MACH: If that's the only comment, then
8 we can probably approve them with the comment saying
9 they're approved with the questions being added.
10 Okay.

11 MR. COLLINS: Is that acceptable? And then
12 we will add them and get them out to everybody;
13 right?

14 MR. MACH: Yes.

15 MR. COLLINS: Okay. If no one objects, are
16 there any other comments? The minutes for April are
17 approved with that correction.

18 MS. HUNTER: I have to abstain. I wasn't
19 here.

20 MR. COLLINS: They're approved.

21 Moving along, it's my turn.

22 The next presentation that you're going
23 to see -- actually, the first presentation that
24 you're going to see is for the Federal Facility Site
25 Remediation Agreement that was signed between

1 California DTSC and the Navy, and I have handouts on
2 the table for those that want to have a complete set
3 of slides.

4 What I thought I'd do is just go through
5 the basic sections of the agreement. If you want to
6 see the entire agreement, we have a copy in the
7 library that you can read.

8 As far as Section 1, it covers the
9 jurisdiction where both the state and the Navy
10 wanted to document for the record why they were
11 entering into this agreement. For California, they
12 derive their authority through the Resource
13 Conservation & Recovery Act or RCRA, and also
14 through the California Health & Safety Code.

15 MS. HUNTER: Bill, that's the jurisdiction to
16 enter, but what's the answer to why the parties
17 wanted to enter into this agreement?

18 MR. COLLINS: I will get to that.

19 For the Navy, the jurisdiction question
20 was answered by the Comprehensive Environmental
21 Response & Liability Act better known as CERCLA; the
22 National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA; the Defense
23 Environmental Restoration Program, which we call
24 DERP. We don't really use the term very often; and
25 Executive Order 12580.

1 MS. HUNTER: Which is which one?

2 MR. COLLINS: The Executive Order?

3 MS. HUNTER: Uh--huh.

4 MR. COLLINS: That's the one where the
5 President has deferred the authority given to him by
6 Congress to the Department of Defense to manage the
7 CERCLA sites.

8 Section 2 covers the Findings of Fact.
9 Now, some of this is just for law purposes.

10 No. 1, the Navy is the owner and
11 operator of the hazardous waste facility.

12 No. 2, the Navy was awarded a hazardous
13 waste facility permit December 21, 1989. It's been
14 updated since then. The hazardous wastes have been
15 and continue to be released into the environment.

16 In 1983 the Navy identified 12 hazardous
17 waste disposal sites.

18 In 1986 contamination was detected in
19 the ground or in the soil at the Industrial Waste
20 Treatment Plant.

21 In 1984 we had installed wells at the
22 Industrial Waste Treatment Plant, and we had found
23 chlorinated compounds in the groundwater, and
24 they've been detected right up to the present, also.

25 In 1989 DTSC went out to North Island

1 and conducted a RCRA Facility Assessment and checked
2 on chemicals or areas where chemicals may have been
3 released into the environment. As a result, DTSC
4 has concluded that further investigation is
5 necessary. They concluded that hazardous waste have
6 migrated from the facility into the environment via
7 the soil and groundwater, and that contaminants
8 include VOCs, semi volatile organic compounds, heavy
9 metals, petroleum hydrocarbons, and PCBs.

10 There's a section on Determinations,
11 which to most people wouldn't seem to be actually
12 too important, but for purposes of the law, the
13 United States Department of the Navy is identified
14 as a person. The Naval Air Station North Island is
15 identified as a facility.

16 MS. HUNTER: Can I ask you a question about
17 that?

18 MR. COLLINS: Yes.

19 MS. HUNTER: So that means whenever they
20 refer to "facility," that's the entire base.

21 MR. COLLINS: Correct.

22 MS. HUNTER: So the entire base is the
23 hazardous waste facility that's addressed in this.

24 MR. COLLINS: For the purposes of corrective
25 action, it's the whole base.

1 MS. HUNTER: Right. Okay.

2 MR. COLLINS: And then the United States is
3 identified as the owner of a facility as defined in
4 CERCLA and as the owner or operator of a facility
5 under RCRA and the Health & Safety Code. This just
6 ties down the position of the U.S. Government in
7 relationship to the property and to the law.

8 Section 4 is the Purpose of this
9 Agreement. One is to satisfy the Navy's corrective
10 action obligations required by the permit. Every
11 RCRA hazardous waste permit that's issued has
12 corrective action requirements in them.

13 It's also to resolve the litigation
14 between the Navy and the state surrounding the
15 Corrective Action Order that was issued May 30,
16 1997. You'll remember that the corrective action
17 requirement from the permit was deferred by the
18 state to this Corrective Action Order. In that
19 order the Navy was given the option or allowed to
20 develop a Federal Facility Site Remediation
21 Agreement with the state to conduct those corrective
22 action requirements.

23 And the third thing is to coordinate
24 the Navy's satisfaction of its corrective action
25 obligations under RCRA and CERCLA. Both laws

1 require us to clean up the sites.

2 Scope of the Agreement. It's pretty
3 much the same. The agreement is to enable the
4 Navy to implement RCRA corrective action
5 obligations. The agreement extends to the entire
6 facility, fence line to fence line. Any corrective
7 action in progress at the time the agreement was
8 signed is incorporated into this agreement. So all
9 of our past work that was going on for many years is
10 now under the same rules as the future work that
11 will come up.

12 Two slides on one here. Section 6 deals
13 with RCRA/CERCLA coordination. It can be best
14 summarized by saying that the Navy can discharge its
15 RCRA obligations through CERCLA response actions,
16 and also that the state will provide the necessary
17 oversight to make sure that we do it right.

18 Section 7 covers definitions so that
19 people won't get confused, and this agreement uses
20 the definitions in the Health & Safety Code,
21 Chapters 6.5 and 6.8 of Division 20 unless otherwise
22 noted or defined. And there are other definitions
23 within the agreement that have to be used.

24 Section 8 covers the Work To Be
25 Performed. In many ways it doesn't say a lot, but

1 it does say that the Navy shall perform the work
2 directed by DTSC in a manner and by due date
3 specified in the Site Management Plan.

4 MS. HUNTER: Let me ask you a quick question
5 about that.

6 MR. COLLINS: Sure.

7 MS. HUNTER: So if there's a violation of
8 this FFSRA, is that also a violation of your
9 hazardous waste permit?

10 MR. COLLINS: There is a ripple down effect.
11 I believe I cover that towards the end here.

12 MS. HUNTER: Okay.

13 MR. COLLINS: Section 9, Project Managers,
14 just states that the Navy and DTSC will reach a
15 point where one project manager is responsible for
16 overseeing and implementation of this agreement. For
17 the Navy that's me, and for DTSC at this time it's
18 Alice Gimeno, but Alice is leaving and going on to
19 another job at DTSC, so Rafat Abbasi will end up
20 being the project manager, the way I understand it.

21 Section 10 takes into account Document
22 Review and Approval. This section establishes the
23 procedures that the parties will use to provide the
24 technical support, notice, review, comments, and
25 other responses regarding the work that we're doing

1 out at the island. It also states that DTSC has the
2 approval authority over all draft/final documents.
3 That would include work plans and final reports,
4 closure reports. They get the final cut on it and
5 they let us know what they think, and then we work
6 to smooth it out.

7 Section 11 addresses Emergencies and
8 Removal Actions. It covers the discovery and
9 notification, what to do if we find something that
10 represents an emergency, who do we notify, how fast
11 do we have to notify them? It also addresses if the
12 state is out there and happens to see something that
13 appears to be an emergency and how fast they have to
14 act and what they have to do.

15 It discusses work stoppages. If we have
16 a project going on and an emergency comes up, we
17 might have to stop our work or a remedial
18 investigation or actually another removal or
19 something to allow the emergency to be addressed.
20 This covers that, and it also defines the terms for
21 emergency, time critical and non-time critical
22 removals.

23 I'm moving on to Section 12, Deadlines
24 and Site Management Plan. In order to ensure that
25 the work gets done in a timely manner and a

1 reasonable manner, DTSC and the Navy will develop a
2 schedule. The Navy will agree to live up to the
3 schedule. The state will do its best to ensure that
4 their portions of the agreement with respect to the
5 schedule, which comes down to their review times of
6 our reports, are timely and they get their work done
7 on time so that we can meet our schedule. This is
8 what it's all about.

9 And what we look at is the year that
10 we're in right now, the next year which is a budget
11 year, and then the planning year. Those projects
12 are pretty much lined out. In the past when I came
13 here and proposed what work we wanted to do in
14 future years and gave you the work that was going on
15 now plus two more years out, that's the idea of
16 this. And what we try to do then is set up a
17 reasonable schedule for getting that work done, and
18 then we try to look even farther out. We're trying
19 to actually see to the end of the job and come up
20 with some schedules.

21 The schedules that are in the early
22 years, these in particular, have deadlines which are
23 enforceable. The projects farther out are not
24 because we haven't gotten close enough to really
25 understand all the work that will be involved.

1 These are the items that are considered
2 when developing the schedule and the Site Management
3 Plan. First of all, it's relative risk, and then
4 potential or future use of the facility, ecological
5 impacts, intrinsic value of the project, cost
6 effectiveness, regulatory requirements,
7 environmental justice, and finally actual and
8 anticipated funding levels.

9 I believe at various times we've come to
10 our RAB meetings and told you that Congress had
11 decided to cut our budget by 10 percent or 15
12 percent, and it's happened more than once, but
13 that's why it's in there.

14 Section 13, I did not really give you
15 any bullets for this one. It's the budget and
16 development of the Site Management Plan section.
17 It's rather boring.

18 Section 14, the agreement covers
19 submittals -- I'll shorten it down here -- on
20 quarterly reports and to report certification.
21 Report certification is a requirement that the state
22 has to close out a site. Quarterly reports are the
23 responsibility of the Navy.

24 MS. HUNTER: Bill, on 13 these two things are
25 put together because you had to amend your Site

1 Management Plan based on a budget crunch. That's the
2 kind of Site Management Amendment they're talking
3 about?

4 MR. COLLINS: In 13?

5 MS. HUNTER: Yeah.

6 MR. COLLINS: 13 is --

7 MS. HUNTER: I mean, there might be a lot of
8 reasons why you would want to amend the Site
9 Management Plan.

10 MR. COLLINS: Yeah.

11 MS. HUNTER: And all covered here are just
12 the ones that would be budget driven.

13 MR. COLLINS: Everything would be covered
14 there for any reason at all in the development of
15 the budget and amending the Site Management. It
16 could be a variety of reasons, and this just covers
17 what the process is to change it.

18 MS. HUNTER: Okay.

19 MR. COLLINS: It's not supposed to be a
20 one-sided amendment. It's supposed to be a
21 cooperative thing.

22 MS. HUNTER: But it covers any amendment even
23 if it's not a budget reason why you're amending it.

24 MR. COLLINS: Correct.

25 Section 15 talks about the proposed

1 contractor or consultant. All of the work has to be
2 conducted under a California professional engineer
3 or registered geologist. They want some quality
4 behind the work. They also expect that the
5 contractor has some technical experience. This is
6 so that we don't go out and just hire some little
7 fly-by-night company to come out to North Island and
8 do our environmental program when they really don't
9 know what the environment is besides maybe taking
10 out the trash on Thursday night, and they can
11 identify rock and soil and that's about it. We don't
12 want that guy.

13 Section 16 talks about quality
14 assurance, and this is for our data that we collect.
15 In the agreement the Navy must use California
16 certified labs wherever possible. Now, in the past
17 we have had circumstances where California has had
18 no certified lab. In that case we will propose
19 something to the state and go through a -- not a
20 mini certification, but we will establish an
21 agreement to use certain labs.

22 MS. FARGO: You mean they haven't had a
23 certified lab for a specific test or never?

24 MR. COLLINS: For a specific test.

25 MS. FARGO: Okay.

1 MR. McCAULEY: What kind of test is that,
2 Bill?

3 MR. COLLINS: A lot of marine tests, bioassay
4 type work. Some tests are very exotic and not every
5 lab can afford to do it or would want to carry out
6 and go through the process, and some testing methods
7 are relatively new, but yet they're being proposed
8 by EPA.

9 MR. McCAULEY: You're talking the 1600
10 series EPA?

11 MR. COLLINS: It could be normally any
12 chemical series.

13 MR. McCAULEY: Okay.

14 MS. FARGO: But there is some quality
15 assurance if it's a lab by the state because
16 otherwise the data is useless.

17 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Well, we work that out
18 ahead of time before we use the lab to establish
19 credibility.

20 MS. FARGO: Okay.

21 MR. COLLINS: Section 17 and 18. 17 covers
22 the sampling and data/document availability. All of
23 the sampling results shall be submitted to DTSC. We
24 can't hide anything we find. If we go out and take
25 a little sample over here, we can't choose to just

1 exclude that from the report. That's not playing
2 fair.

3 And if the State decides they want to
4 come out and take duplicate samples while we're in
5 the field or they want to split the sample, that's
6 okay. We're not going to interfere with that. And
7 then they take the sample and run it at their own
8 laboratory and don't frequently tell us what the
9 results were.

10 The State Certification, the Navy shall
11 submit Closeout Inspection Reports when we get to
12 the end of a project, and then the state is charged
13 with certifying those. If they don't agree with us,
14 then they tell us why, and we go back and we fill in
15 the data, and then we ask for approval again.

16 Section 19 covers extensions. Basically
17 it says that the Navy may request schedule
18 extensions for good cause. There are a lot of
19 things that are good causes. A lot of them are
20 covered by force majeure.

21 MR. MACH: But the state may also ask the
22 Navy for extensions.

23 MR. COLLINS: True. The state has in the
24 past at times asked the Navy for an extension.

25 Basically we try on a first draft of a

1 report for a 60-day review period. That's what the
2 state says it wants. And then the Navy takes the
3 report back, fixes it up, and we resubmit; and on
4 the second review they have 30 days. Now, it is
5 conceivable that some of these reports might be so
6 thick that 60 days may not be reasonable nor 30. It
7 may be difficult, in which case generally the state
8 has actually asked for permission to delay their
9 comments. They wouldn't really need to, but if they
10 take longer than the agreed amount of time, then the
11 Navy schedule is also moved out to a set amount of
12 time, too.

13 Under Force Majeure, they're basically
14 things that we can't control. Acts of God, war,
15 fire, civil disturbance. I didn't list every one of
16 them in there, as you can pretty much tell. A lot
17 of these would either tie up the funding for other
18 purposes or prevent you from getting to the site;
19 and the last one I've spoken about already.

20 Now, when people sign agreements, they
21 generally agree. We have this in there to cover
22 both the state's concerns and the Navy's concerns
23 under RCRA and CERCLA, and we have dispute
24 resolutions. There are going to be some times when
25 we just don't agree, in which case it may be between

1 the project managers we can't resolve the question.
2 No matter what we do, we just can't get an answer,
3 so we elevate it to the next level of supervisors,
4 and they try. And when that fails, it goes up
5 higher. And finally -- not finally, but locally it
6 ends up with a panel involving the Commanding
7 Officer of the installation, the branch chief of
8 DTSC, and another person trying to figure out what
9 to do, what's right in this case. Is the state
10 right? Is the Navy right? Or are they both wrong
11 or both right? What do we do? And it can go
12 higher. It can actually get to the point where they
13 sue us under the law and then we counter sue. I
14 don't look forward to that happening, and I don't
15 really see it happening.

16 Other Claims, Section 22. The state is
17 not restricted to this agreement. The state can
18 take action under RCRA, CERCLA, state law, any other
19 environmental law really for matters not performed
20 under this agreement. This agreement really takes
21 into account corrective action on the base. The
22 Navy can't say, well, this recent spill out here or
23 this other environmental violation or problem, you
24 can't do it because it's not in this agreement. You
25 can't make us do it because this agreement takes

1 into account
2 everything, and that's not really what it's set up
3 for. This is set up to manage corrective action.
4 This is not an "out" for the Navy to avoid complying
5 with other laws.

6 This section also takes into account
7 Natural Resources Claims.

8 Now, this section, Section 23, is really
9 for the state. DTSC can initiate any action or
10 pursue any legal or equitable remedy. DTSC reserves
11 all of its statutory and regulatory power and
12 authority. DTSC can disapprove of any of our work;
13 can actually make us go back out to the field to do
14 it over again. They have the right to go out there
15 and do it themselves if they choose, hire their
16 contractor and go out to North Island and do the
17 investigation and the cleanup, whatever, if
18 that's what they think it takes.

19 DTSC reserves the right to order the
20 Navy to stop work under this agreement until things
21 are straightened out, in which case then after that
22 problem is straightened out, then the agreement
23 would go back into effect where the work will be
24 conditioned.

25 This agreement by itself, this is not a

1 permit. Now, both parties reserve the right to
2 raise or assert any defense that they might have
3 under the law also, so we can get in there and
4 argue. And a lot of this rolls around, like I said,
5 into a dispute resolution where we just can't agree
6 on something. And we maintain that we have some
7 rights and DTSC says, well, they have certain rights
8 and obligations under the law, also.

9 MR. McCAULEY: Bill, in the past have you had
10 disputes with DTSC?

11 MR. COLLINS: Nothing in the last few years.

12 MS. HUNTER: Yeah, over the Corrective Action
13 Order.

14 MR. BILLS: Which one?

15 MS. HUNTER: Didn't you have like a major
16 dispute over the Corrective Action Order?

17 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That would be one.

18 MS. HUNTER: That was a lawsuit, I think.

19 MR. McCAULEY: Just curious.

20 MR. COLLINS: But that was settled.

21 Section 24, Real Property Transfer. I
22 don't see this happening too soon at North Island,
23 but if the Navy was going to sell off the land out
24 here or lease it out, we would have to give 90-day
25 notice to the state before we could do it.

1 Section 25 covers the state. The state
2 must comply with CEQA.

3 Permits. This is a little long. Now,
4 the Navy has been granted a RCRA permit to operate
5 the plant at North Island. Also, it has the
6 corrective action requirement in it. This agreement
7 supersedes the requirements of the Corrective Action
8 Order which superseded the requirements that were in
9 the permit. So it had a ripple down effect, and
10 here we are now using the agreement to satisfy the
11 requirements of the permit itself.

12 No permit or permit modification is
13 required for the activities under this agreement,
14 especially those here where there's a RAP or ROD
15 signed by DTSC.

16 MS. HUNTER: You mean by that that no permit
17 modification of your existing haz waste permit is
18 needed to do this.

19 MR. COLLINS: Correct.

20 MS. HUNTER: You also mean for this one and
21 the next one that you don't need to get any
22 permit -- any other permit like an air permit or --

23 MR. COLLINS: Correct. For the second bullet
24 we would not have to modify the permit to clean up a
25 site. The third bullet, we don't have to get an air

1 permit or a water permit or permits from the corps
2 to complete our actions under CERCLA, and the state
3 has agreed to that. That's in the law.

4 MR. MACH: But we already didn't need them
5 under CERCLA.

6 MS. HUNTER: But it still seems really bad
7 that if you have a remediation that's going to emit
8 a lot of air pollution, then you should have to have
9 an air permit.

10 MR. COLLINS: Well, we do handle that by
11 treating all of those laws as ARARs -- remember,
12 applicable or appropriate and relevant laws so they
13 have requirements in there, and we roll all the
14 substantive portions of those laws into our plans
15 for the cleanup so that we meet the substance of
16 what would have been required under the permit. We
17 just don't fill out the paperwork.

18 MS. HUNTER: So you have to comply with the
19 ARARs, even though you don't have to get a permit.

20 MR. COLLINS: All the time. It just cuts
21 some of the paperwork out. That's all.

22 Now, if for some reason we had to treat
23 the waste off site, then we would have to get a
24 permit, and we would notify DTSC of that.

25 Compliance with applicable laws. This

1 agreement shall not relieve the Navy of its
2 obligation to comply with -- and I was hoping Rafat
3 would be here -- but the hazardous waste cleanup
4 law? I don't know. We don't use that term.

5 MS. HUNTER: That would be too descriptive,
6 Bill, if that were really what it was.

7 MS. RICH: I think it's control. I think
8 it's Hazardous Waste Control Law.

9 MR. COLLINS: Very good.

10 MS. RICH: I believe.

11 MR. COLLINS: There are parts of these laws
12 that we just can't go out and ignore them.

13 MS. RICH: Because in EPA there's a Hazardous
14 Waste Control account, so that's why I think that
15 maybe the "L" is law.

16 MR. COLLINS: Okay. I believe you.

17 Section 28 covers access to the base.
18 The Navy agrees to provide DTSC with access at all
19 reasonable times. The state has agreed to give us
20 24 hours. So they just don't show up at the gate
21 and say "Okay. We want to go out here." They can,
22 but we don't have to let them in for that. We may
23 have to say "Come back tomorrow."

24 MS. HUNTER: This, however, would not apply
25 to inspections of the haz waste facility; right?

1 MR. COLLINS: Correct. Because that's
2 covered under --

3 MS. HUNTER: The permit.

4 MR. COLLINS: Correct. Yes.

5 But normally if an inspection is done
6 out there, they call ahead a day or two and let them
7 know that they're coming out, just to be polite.

8 These slides get smaller so they get
9 quicker.

10 Enforceability. The state can enforce
11 all the deadlines.

12 Record preservation. We agree to keep
13 all the records during the job and for another ten
14 years after a particular project is terminated. If
15 for some reason we choose not to keep the records
16 after that date, DTSC wants to have first dibs on
17 them. We have some requirements under CERCLA to
18 keep records for upwards of 50 years, though. The
19 documents will be stored in a central location. We
20 have our Administrative Record downtown. That's
21 where we store our records.

22 I'll tell you what, these get tiny, and
23 they're tiny for a reason. Actually, they're very
24 short sections and they're boring.

25 Notice to the contractors. We hire a

1 contractor. We give them a copy of the agreement.
2 The one thing I have to figure out is if it's all
3 prime contractors and how big a contract does it
4 need.

5 Modification. The terms that the Navy
6 and DTSC should go through to modify this agreement.

7 Section 33 Termination. This agreement
8 is terminated when the Navy has all of the
9 groundwater, the soil cleaned up to the satisfaction
10 of the state or we can terminate it by ourselves.
11 We can just say "We want out of this agreement,"
12 give 90 days notice, or the state can say "This
13 agreement isn't working" and give us 90 days notice
14 and then it's over with, and then we fall back to
15 the Corrective Action Order. There really is no
16 "out" for cleaning up this place. We have to do it.

17 The effective date was the date when
18 both people signed it. That was January 13th.

19 Notification just tells the state where
20 to mail the documents, and it tells the Navy where
21 to mail the documents.

22 We have the Release of Records. The
23 state can ask for anything to be released to them
24 that might have environmental information on it.
25 Some of it is protected, in which case the Navy --

1 the federal government doesn't have to, in which
2 case when we tell them why, they can petition
3 through other channels to get it, but we don't have
4 to give it to them directly, and it's not covered by
5 dispute resolution.

6 Public participation is required. It
7 always was required under RCRA, and it's required
8 under CERCLA, so this is pretty much what we're
9 doing now.

10 State support. The Navy actually -- we
11 agree to pay them out of our Defense State
12 Memorandum of Agreement account, and we negotiate
13 every year with the state as to what we think we
14 should pay them; and they, of course, counter with
15 what they think we should pay them.

16 And the last five items, severability of
17 a portion of this agreement is illegal. It doesn't
18 mean that the rest of the agreement isn't legal.

19 Integration covers how we're going to
20 behave with each other and tells us that we can't
21 amend, supplement or modify except as provided in
22 the agreement.

23 Section headings. This covers that and
24 says it's just for the convenience.

25 Attachments. There's some attachments

1 to it, one that lists all the SWMUs, all the solid
2 waste management units.

3 And the authority, two people, John
4 Scandura from DTSC, and Elsie Munsell, from the
5 Department of the Navy.

6 That's pretty much it. Did that take up
7 the whole half hour?

8 MS. FARGO: How long is the full agreement --
9 how many pages about?

10 MR. COLLINS: 50, maybe.

11 MS. FARGO: Is it available?

12 MR. COLLINS: It's in the library.

13 MS. HUNTER: I have a couple of questions. Go
14 ahead, Marilyn.

15 MS. FIELD: Bill, two questions. What was
16 the litigation about that this was designed to
17 resolve?

18 MR. COLLINS: We challenged the state's
19 authority to issue a Corrective Action Order.
20 That's the litigation. Nothing more than that.

21 They issued an order, and we felt that
22 they should go through RCRA, through the permit to
23 have us do the corrective action and not through
24 this Corrective Action Order, so we challenged them
25 on it. And then they agreed, well, let's sit down

1 and talk about it all.

2 MS. FIELD: I'm sorry. You felt it should go
3 through the permit process? I thought this was
4 RCRA.

5 MR. COLLINS: No. The RCRA hazardous waste
6 facility permit has a corrective action element in
7 it -- and if you have a copy of the permit, it's on
8 the last page -- and it says that you have to go in
9 and investigate and clean up your old hazardous
10 waste sites or any place that they think may have
11 had hazardous waste disposed or a hazardous
12 constituent. And what the state did was say "Okay.
13 We don't want to put this into the permit per se."
14 So they put in a note there and said that they
15 deferred all of those requirements to a Corrective
16 Action Order, which turned out to have the same
17 power, the same authority, the same amount of work
18 and requirements to do this corrective action work.
19 And one of the lines in there was that the Navy
20 could work out a federal or an FFSRA. We could work
21 out an agreement to do the work. We wouldn't have
22 to stick with the order per se.

23 So we disputed the whole order. We
24 didn't think that they had the authority to issue
25 the order. They had the authority to make us do the

1 work under RCRA through the permit. We just didn't
2 think that they had the authority to issue a
3 Corrective Action Order to make it happen.

4 MS. FIELD: Why did DTSC want to do it that
5 way?

6 MR. COLLINS: You know, I can't really tell
7 you why they did. DTSC would have to tell you. I
8 think it just made it easier to manage the whole
9 permit issue.

10 Do you remember? That was pretty big
11 then.

12 MS. HUNTER: The reason I heard why they
13 wanted to do it that way, not that I can speak for
14 DTSC either, but that when it was in -- this was the
15 only reason -- well, whatever -- what I was told is
16 that if it was in the permit, it was handled by
17 permitting in DTSC, and permitting people are not
18 the cleanup people. The site remediation people who
19 were doing the Corrective Action Order, you would
20 have your Rafats and Alices working on it who do
21 site remediation, not permit writing. And
22 hopefully, we're keeping the site remediation people
23 on the job by having that FFSRA.

24 MR. COLLINS: Yes.

25 MS. HUNTER: Does that make sense?

1 MR. COLLINS: I think that is a good
2 reason -- one good reason why it happened. But
3 prior to that, they had an internal office agreement
4 between permitting and site remediation. Because
5 the permitting people are not familiar with it, they
6 farmed that work out to the office across the hall.

7 MS. RICH: And, unfortunately, Rafat wasn't
8 able to make it tonight and I'm new to the project,
9 but I will definitely forward that to him and have
10 him come back with the answer to that.

11 MR. COLLINS: There may be another reason,
12 but it hasn't been given to us.

13 MS. FIELD: I had another question.

14 Under Section 13, the Budget Development
15 of the Management Site Plan, I was interested in the
16 budget development process. As you talked about,
17 sometimes you have money cutbacks and they may
18 impinge on your budget, but how do you work out an
19 acceptable budget between you and DTSC for cleanup?

20 MR. COLLINS: First, we pick the projects
21 that we think should go forward. Generally, if a
22 cleanup project is in process right now for remedial
23 action or interim removal action is going on on the
24 site, those projects get funded first every year. We
25 keep the cleanups going on.

1 Then there's another set of criteria for
2 projects after that, and that really comes down to
3 risk. We try to put the money where the real
4 problems are. So rather than go out and investigate
5 a little park where somebody thought something was
6 spilled 20 years ago versus going out to Site 9 and
7 actually doing something and finding it and getting
8 something cleaned up, we go to where the risk really
9 is.

10 And then you have a second tier of sites
11 where there's less risk but there is still a need to
12 know what's out there or to evaluate them, and we
13 try then to filter those in. And we know that the
14 federal budget, as far as the environmental
15 restoration goes, has a cap on it. And we
16 anticipate that in our office in Southwest Division
17 that we will have approximately \$55 million a year
18 to manage that program for approximately 30 some
19 bases. And everybody's got problems, and everybody
20 thinks that their community and their base needs the
21 money more than the other guy.

22 Basically over the past several years
23 North Island had been getting 7 and a half, eight
24 and a half million dollars. So we know about what
25 we're going to get, and we can evaluate the projects

1 we want, and based on what we've done in the past,
2 we can come up with a dollar value for what they're
3 worth, and then we just back them down, and finally
4 we end up at zero. And then projects after that we
5 try to move them to the next year, the following
6 year, so that's pretty much it.

7 MS. FIELD: Well, I can see how there could
8 be a dispute about whether you had the funds to do
9 what DTSC thought ought to be done, and if that
10 should happen that you didn't have the funds in your
11 budget, how do you work things out like that? Is
12 that what this provision deals with?

13 MR. COLLINS: That's part of it. We would,
14 like I said, try to get the jobs done with the
15 cleanups that are already in progress, not stop
16 them, keep them going, and then spend the money at
17 whatever happens to be the worst site that's still
18 being investigated or getting ready for cleanup.

19 And eventually we're going to run out of
20 money. We can't do everything that everybody wants
21 every year. If they gave us more money, we could,
22 but we would take it away from maybe Barstow or Camp
23 Pendleton or somebody else. And you know that they
24 would be saying something pretty soon -- the
25 communities up there would say something.

1 MS. PARKER: Do you want to just mention,
2 though, the site management plan? That's probably
3 the next step.

4 MR. COLLINS: I'll get to that. It will be
5 in my next topic.

6 MS. HUNTER: So if there's a violation of the
7 FFSRA, what's that a violation of? The agreement?
8 Your haz waste permit? CERCLA? RCRA?

9 MR. COLLINS: It's a violation of the
10 agreement first. We try to resolve it right here in
11 the agreement.

12 MS. HUNTER: Is anything in the agreement
13 that says if you violate it, it's X thousand dollars
14 a day or it --

15 MR. COLLINS: No.

16 MS. HUNTER: So there's no fines.

17 So it's not a violation of your permit
18 if you violate your cleanup schedule. That's how it
19 was -- it was a violation when it was in the permit.
20 So that's different; is that right?

21 MR. COLLINS: And actually, it never came up,
22 though.

23 MS. HUNTER: But theoretically, if there was
24 a violation under the old way, a cleanup, you would
25 violate it.

1 MR. COLLINS: They could write us a letter
2 and threaten us with fines or eliminating the
3 permit. If we cause them grief and fail to do
4 what's in the agreement and what we've got in our
5 site management plan, what we budgeted for it, we
6 just fail to do that work, this agreement will be
7 over and we will fall back into the Corrective
8 Action Order where --

9 MS. HUNTER: No. It would be a violation of
10 the agreement. It's not over unless DTSC says
11 "Okay. All bets are off."

12 MR. COLLINS: It will come to an end. I
13 would have that feeling.

14 MS. HUNTER: And then it would go back to
15 corrective action which would be back in litigation
16 because that was never resolved or was that?

17 MR. COLLINS: Well, the agreement I think
18 resolved part of it.

19 MS. HUNTER: Well, if the agreement's gone,
20 then --

21 MR. COLLINS: Then we would go back and hash
22 that over again.

23 MS. HUNTER: The other thing --

24 MR. COLLINS: In any case, the permit would -
25 - they'd fall back on the permit.

1 MS. HUNTER: So all of the corrective action
2 work would fall back into the permit, and then --
3 okay.

4 And is there anything in there that you
5 can't use contractors that are in violation of
6 hazardous waste laws or I'm thinking of SAIC that
7 violated -- gave false information to EPA.

8 Is there any limit on what kind of
9 contractors you can hire, if they have them?

10 MR. COLLINS: Not specifically, no.

11 MS. HUNTER: I guess that's input I'd like to
12 give to DTSC that there should be something in the
13 agreement that we don't want to have the Navy hiring
14 repeat violators to do work.

15 MRS. KAUPP: I'm curious to know with all the
16 cleanup activity at North Island why it wasn't
17 classified a Superfund site.

18 MR. COLLINS: That's an EPA decision, and I
19 believe DTSC -- California as a whole, DTSC has had
20 something to say to EPA about that, but we weren't
21 told any of it.

22 MS. RICH: And actually, that would be USEPA.
23 They're the ones that handle that. They're the ones
24 that make that determination, not state EPA.

25 MR. COLLINS: I think the state did discuss

1 it with them, and the state convinced them that they
2 could do the job.

3 MR. McCAULEY: That's a difficult thing to
4 get on the NPL.

5 MS. HUNTER: Well, my understanding is that
6 we met all the criteria to be an NPL site. It was
7 ready to happen, and the governor and the state and
8 Mayor Golding were part of this panel that decided
9 they didn't want any more NPL sites in California
10 because it was bad for our image, and therefore it
11 didn't get added. So it was political for some
12 reason, not a factual determination.

13 MR. COLLINS: We weren't privy to that.

14 MRS. KAUPP: Then the second part of my
15 question was if it was listed as a Superfund site,
16 would North Island get a bigger chunk of money for
17 cleanup activities instead of the 7 percent?

18 MR. COLLINS: Not really, no. Because
19 actually EPA and DTSC and the Water Board, they've
20 all decided that rather than devote the money just
21 to NPL sites, to spread it around where the risk is
22 present. So if we were NPL, we wouldn't necessarily
23 get any more money.

24 It's not really a bonus anymore. It used to be
25 the NPL bases got the lion's share of the money, and

1 all the other bases tried to get by on a million
2 bucks a year, and it was horrible. That was a
3 problem here in North Island. We were getting a
4 million bucks a year until that agreement was made,
5 and then all of a sudden we got a lot of money
6 because risk counted. It counted more than just
7 being NPL. Okay?

8 Next is Mark.

9 MR. BONSAVAGE: Recently we finished a study
10 that was called the Evaluation of Monitored Natural
11 Attenuation of Groundwater at Site 5.

12 Recently the activity of studying the
13 chemicals in the water rather than just going out
14 and immediately cleaning up has become a trend that
15 possibly if we just leave the materials there,
16 they'll naturally degrade. And to make this work,
17 you really have to look at everything that's going
18 on in the groundwater to make sure that it's not
19 going off the site. And that's what we did at this
20 site. It's actually one of the first -- I believe
21 one of the first Navy sites that did a study like
22 this.

23 We hired a contractor called Parsons
24 Engineering, and what they did is basically study
25 the groundwater out at Site 5 for four quarters.

1 They measured the volatile organic compounds, and
2 they also measured the other chemical parameters of
3 the water that would contribute to the chemicals
4 naturally attenuating over time, and we wanted to
5 see if this was really taking place out here.

6 Everyone has a map, and you can also
7 look up here. The oval teardrops are basically the
8 VOCs out at Site 5. And from this report what we
9 determined is that the natural attenuation is taking
10 place, but it's taking place slowly. And in order
11 for us to meet our cleanup goals or our cleanup
12 level that we set for this site, it would take I
13 think it's 60 to 78 years.

14 So we thought that even though monitored
15 natural attenuation would work, that this material
16 really is not going off the site; that 60 to 78
17 years is too long to wait for all of this material
18 to go away; so we thought that the best thing to do
19 was to go out and do a removal action.

20 And also as part of this, we didn't want
21 to just ignore everything that we found out during
22 this study, so we wanted to see what technologies
23 would actually work well with monitored natural
24 attenuation after you went out and did a cleanup
25 because even if you do a cleanup, you're still going

1 to be -- the edges of the plume or there's going to
2 be areas that you don't quite get everything, so
3 you're still going to have to monitor the site a
4 little bit.

5 So we put together a table of
6 technologies just to start off, which I identify
7 technologies that if you went out and did this
8 natural attenuation as the next step, it's a good
9 step.

10 So this report is actually -- it gets
11 into a lot of detail in the water chemistry, and
12 it's actually more complicated than advanced biology
13 and chemistry. It's pretty advanced. Even I
14 stumble on some of this stuff.

15 But in the end it says that this is
16 taking place at the site. I don't want to take up
17 too much time because Rich needs some time.

18 But if you'll look at the maps, this map
19 here, you can basically see the dates of October
20 '97, January '98, April '98, and July '98 that
21 really this plume is not really going anywhere over
22 time. It's actually decreasing a little bit by
23 July. The two blocks are the pits or where the VOCs
24 were dumped.

25 And if you look at the other figure,

1 this one, you can see some of the concentrations we
2 have out there where Monitoring Well 21, you have
3 DCE at 550,000 parts per billion. That's pretty
4 high, 550,000. We used 3.2 parts per
5 billion for total VOCs as our cleanup goal to run
6 the model, and 550,000 is quite a bit above it.

7 MR. McCAULEY: So you're going to let this
8 stuff naturally attenuate?

9 MR. BONSAVAGE: No. What we decided that 60
10 to 78 years is too long to just let this material
11 naturally attenuate; that we wanted to do something
12 now. There's also concern at the site because
13 there's vinyl chloride, which there's a concern that
14 vinyl chloride might actually migrate up through the
15 soil, so we wanted to do something quickly at this
16 site.

17 MR. COLLINS: You'll notice that the plume is
18 near the slough, the little blue finger that goes in
19 there; and there was some concern by some people
20 that the flow, because of the irrigation of the golf
21 course, might be to the slough and then the
22 chemicals would wash out and people might be exposed
23 to that when they play golf.

24 Although the studies that we've done
25 show that generally the flow of groundwater is to

1 the northwest or to the west from here instead of
2 directly south into the slough, conditions could
3 change for one reason or another in certain years,
4 and it just makes sense to go at this stuff to get
5 it cleaned up.

6 MR. McCAULEY: Okay.

7 MR. BONSAVAGE: One other thing before I turn
8 it over to Rich is that we put together a table.
9 When we first -- what we did is we plugged this into
10 a computer program called Bioscreen where it takes
11 into consideration all of your water chemistry
12 parameters and it basically tells you -- shows you
13 how the plume will shrink over the years,
14 considering all the factors that make the VOCs
15 naturally attenuate.

16 And when we first ran the model, we came
17 up with some outrageous number like 600 years, but
18 what we found is that the model automatically
19 assumed that you're cleaning up to zero, which takes
20 a very long time to reach zero.

21 So keeping that in mind, I thought,
22 "Well, we need to, number one, set a cleanup level
23 which we set at 3.2 micrograms for total VOCs.

24 And I also wanted to see that "Well, if
25 it's going to take that long, let's look at it after

1 20 years how far along are we; then after 40 years
2 how far along are we. And what we actually found is
3 that after 20 years, about 95 percent of the
4 chemicals have attenuated; and after 40 years you're
5 up around 99 percent. So those last 20 years you're
6 actually only going to reduce about 1 percent.

7 But even at 90 -- you know, we're in the
8 90 percent after 40 years, we thought that
9 maintaining it and monitoring it would be too much,
10 that we're better off going in and reducing these
11 high levels of contaminant areas.

12 So this is the report that will come
13 out. It's actually in the mail. I just sent it out
14 in the mail today, and we'll put one in the library,
15 and you can -- it's actually basically a textbook on
16 natural attenuation. If you want to learn about
17 monitored natural attenuation, you can actually
18 learn it from reading this report.

19 MRS. KAUPP: Can you orient me to where on
20 the base this site is located?

21 MR. BONSAVAGE: You can see on the map a
22 little bit. Right here is Coronado. Here's the
23 teardrop.

24 MRS. KAUPP: So is that site close to the
25 north beach storm drain outfall?

1 MR. BONSAVAGE: I'm not sure what the north
2 beach storm drain outfall is. Right here?

3 MR. MACH: Yes. That's the outfall right
4 there.

5 MRS. KAUPP: And could that site be leaching
6 materials or whatever into the storm drain outfall?

7 MR. MACH: No.

8 MR. BONSAVAGE: No. We've got monitoring
9 wells close to -- you can see all these circles --
10 so we've basically got this plume surrounded with
11 monitoring wells, and we know that it's going in one
12 direction and it's going slow.

13 MS. FIELD: Without having read that book,
14 and the answer to this question is undoubtedly in
15 that book, and when you talk about this stuff
16 attenuating naturally, where is it going? Is it
17 going into the air? Is it flowing into the ground?
18 Is it changing?

19 MR. BONSAVAGE: Well, I'll give you the
20 textbook definition. Attenuation includes
21 biodegradation, hydrolysis, dispersion, dilution,
22 adsorption. So what does that mean?

23 No. It basically -- the chemistry of
24 it's changing. So I would say no, it's not going
25 into the air. It's basically changing -- the

1 chemistry of the chemicals are changing in the
2 water, and it is diluting too. It's in a large body
3 of water, and the concentrations will just decrease
4 naturally by spreading out in the water.

5 MS. FIELD: So that's the dilution and the
6 dispersed system?

7 MR. BONSAVAGE: Dilution and dispersion are
8 small. They're parts of natural attenuation, yes.

9 MS. FIELD: So that's what's been happening
10 over time?

11 MR. BONSAVAGE: Well, I would say that's only
12 a small part of what's happening. It's mostly
13 biodegradation is where you have hydrolysis, where
14 you actually have a breakdown of the chemicals, but
15 to a small degree you also have dilution.

16 MR. MACH: Basically the chemicals that were
17 disposed of here were TCE and PCE, the
18 trichloroethene and the tetrachloroethene. And you
19 see on the map that Mark's talking about, the
20 highest hits are dichloroethene and vinyl chloride,
21 which is the same as monoethene.

22 So essentially what you've got, you're
23 going from four and three chlorine ions on the
24 chemicals down to two and then down to one, and
25 eventually that last one pops off and you're down to

1 ethene, and then that is like a petroleum type
2 product that easily goes down to H₂O, which is
3 water.

4 So the adsorption and dispersion and all
5 that happens very early in the plume, and if that
6 were all that was going on, then you would see high
7 levels of TCE and PCE, but you don't. You're seeing
8 high levels of DCE and vinyl chloride which is
9 saying that biodegradation is happening. It's
10 reducing the chlorines on these chemicals.
11 Unfortunately, it makes them more toxic. But
12 eventually once it gets past vinyl chloride down to
13 ethene, then it's way less toxic.

14 MS. FIELD: It's toxic in the sense that
15 you'd have to come in contact with it to be toxic?

16 MR. MACH: Right.

17 MR. BONSAVAGE: But at a different
18 concentration.

19 MR. MACH: The cleanup level for vinyl
20 chloride or DCE is lower than it is for TCE or PCE.
21 Mark's talking about 3.2 for DCE. The cleanup
22 levels using the same standard, which are the Ocean
23 Plan or the Bays and Estuary standard, had 3.2 for
24 DCE and 92 for TCE.

25 So you've got over --

1 MS. FIELD: 92 what? 92 percent?

2 MR. MACH: Parts per billion. So it's an
3 order of magnitude difference.

4 MR. BONSAVAGE: And you can see with the
5 wells on this figure, the wells that we have placed
6 all around, you actually have wells on this side of
7 it with non-detects and your detection limits are
8 down well into the parts per billion, so it's well
9 below that. You know that it's not -- and when you
10 think it might be diluting and going off to the
11 side, well, no. You really know that it's going in
12 this direction, and it's not at these very low
13 detection limits anywhere around this area.

14 So to a certain extent the
15 concentrations decrease in all directions, but
16 mostly here's where your source is, and you know the
17 water flows this way, and this is basically where
18 the contaminants are.

19 MS. FIELD: Have you figured out how you're
20 going to do the removal action yet?

21 MR. BONSAVAGE: Rich is going to talk about
22 that next.

23 MR. MACH: I'm next.

24 MR. COLLINS: Are you done, Mark, then? Then
25 we'll have Rich get up and tell us all about the

1 removal.

2 MR. BONSAVAGE: Anything else?

3 MR. KAUPP: Yeah. I wanted to ask do you
4 ever think of having somebody at your site and
5 measure the rates of bacterial degradation directly?
6 I mean not mathematically, but actually --

7 MR. MACH: You mean bacterial count?

8 MR. KAUPP: No, no. I mean actually measure
9 the transformation product and isotope enrichment.

10 MR. BONSAVAGE: With what enrichment?

11 MR. KAUPP: Isotope enrichment.

12 MR. BONSAVAGE: No.

13 MR. MACH: I wasn't involved in the whole
14 setup of how that study went on. I'm not sure
15 exactly what the parameters were.

16 Michael Pound, who's in our tech group
17 and has been here a few times, could probably answer
18 that a lot better.

19 MR. BONSAVAGE: In here they get into a
20 little bit on how the compounds are changing, but
21 you really only have a year snapshot, so I don't
22 know if you can tell from a year, four quarters,
23 what the process is.

24 MR. MACH: Basically it's looking at a lot of
25 trends, a lot of studies done by Todd Weidemeyer in

1 looking at what happens to your dissolved phase and
2 your nitrogen and oxygen and CO₂, all of those
3 trends going up and down to show what sort of
4 degradation is happening.

5 MR. BONSAVAGE: I don't know how involved
6 isotope analysis is.

7 MR. LOCKE: Are you talking a tracer so you
8 can follow it?

9 MR. KAUPP: No. I'm talking about stable
10 isotope, looking at actual isotope enrichment
11 compounds, biological transformation.

12 MR. BONSAVAGE: No. We just measured certain
13 chemicals and watched how they changed.

14 MR. KAUPP: You're speculating on the basis
15 of mathematics?

16 MR. BONSAVAGE: Uh--huh.

17 MR. McCAULEY: How much would it cost to do
18 something like that?

19 MR. KAUPP: It depends on who you hire. But
20 it could be -- actually, the technology -- did you
21 go the conference at the Sheraton several weeks ago?

22 MR. BONSAVAGE: The Battelle conference?

23 MR. KAUPP: Yes.

24 MR. BONSAVAGE: No.

25 MR. KAUPP: There was actually a series of

1 presentations there, but there was one that actually
2 showed how to go from start to finish.

3 And I don't know how much it would cost,
4 but just thousands.

5 MS. FARGO: Sandy, are you going to be
6 reviewing the report and giving any public comments
7 because that might be very appropriate and make that
8 exact recommendation, whatever.

9 MR. KAUPP: Sure. I'll look at it.

10 MR. COLLINS: If there are no other
11 questions, then Rich will proceed with the second
12 half.

13 MR. BONSAVAGE: Actually, I put a 30-day
14 review on this because it's not actually a decision
15 document. It's a study. So I wanted the review to
16 go faster. If you're going to look at it and
17 comment on it --

18 MR. KAUPP: Do it quick.

19 MR. BONSAVAGE: Yeah.

20 MR. MACH: I really don't have any overheads.
21 We can just leave this up. There are two handouts
22 in the back. Hopefully, you got them. One's a
23 quick snapshot schedule as to where the project's
24 going; and the other one is a matrix showing all the
25 different technologies that we are looking at for

1 this site.

2 Like Mark said, natural attenuation is
3 happening. If you talk to Michael Pound, he says
4 it's the most ideal site you could ever look at for
5 natural attenuation; however, the cost that would go
6 into to do the monitoring of this monitored natural
7 attenuation for the 60 to 78 years that Mark's
8 talking about is most likely going to be more costly
9 in the long run than it is to go in there and try to
10 do some source removal, remove the hot spots that
11 we're talking about, and then the lower end of the
12 plume naturally degrade.

13 So we've looked at a whole bunch of
14 technologies on here, and you can see all the ones
15 coming down in the purple. It's looking at
16 different types of scenarios.

17 Ex situ would remove the stuff from the
18 ground and then treat it above ground; no action
19 alternative, which has to be evaluated for all
20 actions; and then in situ, doing something within
21 the ground.

22 The only ones that are really viable
23 options are something in situ and, of course, no
24 action alternative. This is going to be a time
25 critical removal action, not a non-time critical, so

1 we're not going to do an EE/CA. We're only going to
2 do an Action Memorandum.

3 There's about six technologies in green
4 here that you can see. Those will be further
5 evaluated in the Action Memorandum, and then a final
6 decision will be made as to which technology we're
7 going to proceed with. We're most likely going to
8 go with some sort of chemical oxidation, either the
9 Fenton's Reagent or the potassium permanganate,
10 which are both on here. Those work very quickly.
11 You pump some of these chemicals down. They oxidize
12 the chemicals very fast, turn them into CO2 and
13 water, and you're done.

14 There's been a lot of work done on this
15 on the East Coast at the Southern Division. And if
16 you recall, Tamara Niles when she was here reviewing
17 Site 9, had actually recommended injection of
18 hydrogen peroxide. Fenton's reagent is hydrogen
19 peroxide with Iron II as well mixed in there.

20 So we're looking at those two chemicals,
21 and we're looking at having an Action Memorandum and
22 a draft work plan out for review in the July time
23 frame; and that is in accordance with the dates that
24 are established in the FFSRA as to how long we have
25 from the time we start our planning process to when

1 we have to get something out for review, and then
2 the CEQA will come shortly thereafter.

3 MS. FIELD: I'm puzzled why this is a time
4 critical action. Hasn't the stuff been there for a
5 long time and is it immediately -- I thought that
6 time critical were for things that were immediately
7 hazardous.

8 MR. MACH: No. An emergency removal action
9 is for something that is an imminent threat like
10 you're talking about. The difference between a time
11 critical and a non-time critical has nothing to do
12 with the seriousness of the contamination. It has
13 to do with how long it's going to take you to get
14 your decision documents and planning done and get
15 into the field and start to work.

16 If you can get all of your planning done
17 in six months or less, it's time critical; and if
18 it's going to take you more than six months, then
19 it's non-time critical and you have to do an EE/CA
20 so you can better evaluate the technologies and do a
21 different sort of planning.

22 In our opinion, this is an easy decision
23 to make to go out there and do source reduction.
24 Chemical oxidation, like I said, is my hunch as to
25 what's going to be chosen for this, and we can get

1 the planning documents done in six months, so that's
2 why it's time critical.

3 That was about all I had planned to say
4 on Site 5. If there are no other questions, I'll
5 jump into Site 9 real quick.

6 I am next, right?

7 MR. COLLINS: Yes, you are.

8 MR. MACH: There's another yellow handout in
9 the back. This is very similar to the handout
10 that's been given out at the last two RAB meetings
11 for the work out at Site 9. This is just updated
12 from the last time.

13 I know that Merry Coons from OHM gave a
14 presentation as to exactly what we plan on doing out
15 there with the enhancement of the soil vapor
16 extraction system with steam injection and free
17 product recovery.

18 Basically what this schedule is showing
19 you is that we have installed most of the pilot
20 study, a portion of this project. We've got the
21 wells installed. We've got the piping for the free
22 product recovery installed. And the free product
23 recovery was supposed to start today, and I'm not
24 sure if they actually turned that on today or if
25 it's going to be tomorrow or Monday that it actually

1 gets turned on. And then that will go for about 20
2 to 30 days of just skimming off the product to see
3 how fast the recovery is, how much we can get off.

4 And then after 20 or 30 days, we're
5 going to start up the steam injection, start pumping
6 steam down there at about 200 degrees Fahrenheit.
7 It's anticipated it will take about 60 days to
8 actually heat up the entire subsurface to about 195
9 degrees. We'll be having the soil vapor extraction
10 system on at that time because as it's heating up,
11 we're going to want to be sucking off everything
12 that's volatilizing; and then we'll run that for
13 about another 30 days or so after the entire system
14 is heated up to see what our radius of influence is
15 for our steam injection, what it is for our soil
16 vapor extraction so that when we come to the
17 full-scale design, we can optimize exactly where the
18 wells will be going.

19 So the revised work plan that will be
20 coming out will be coming out probably before the
21 pilot study is done; however, the actual design for
22 the system, which is not part of the work plan,
23 won't come out until after the pilot study is done
24 so we know exactly where to put the wells.

25 The work plan is going to say "Yeah,

1 we're going to put in wells on a certain radius.
2 Here's the general configuration." Then once we get
3 out there for the design, it's going to be "Okay.
4 We're going to put them 40 feet apart or 45 feet
5 apart." That's not really -- that design aspect is
6 not important to the work plan. So we'll be able to
7 get that work plan modification out to you guys to
8 review probably in the July time frame as well.

9 MS. FARGO: Tell me again what volume of free
10 product you anticipate removing, even a guess.

11 MR. MACH: A guesstimate is that there is
12 about 300,000 to 600,000 gallons down there. If you
13 look at any of the petroleum industry calculations,
14 they generally say they can get up to about 50
15 percent of the petroleum out. That's how much is
16 recoverable.

17 What we're actually looking at is that
18 within about a year with the steam injection, most
19 of these volatile compounds -- the chlorinated
20 compounds that we're really concerned about, the
21 risk drivers -- should be able to be volatilized off
22 within the first year and removed; and then the
23 recoverable portion of the petroleum which could be
24 50 percent, possibly a little more, possibly a
25 little less, we should be able to get off in the

1 next couple of years.

2 MRS. KAUPP: I don't know much about this,
3 but what percentage of the VOCs will be captured,
4 and will there be a certain percentage that will
5 just go into the air?

6 MR. MACH: We're using the same system that
7 was there for the soil vapor extraction before. That
8 system was 99 percent efficient, so possibly 1
9 percent will escape through there.

10 The fact that we're also doing free
11 product recovery at the same time will probably
12 increase the percentage of VOCs that we capture as
13 opposed to emitting because we're not doing all the
14 phase changes. We're not taking them from a liquid
15 to a gas and then condensing it back to a liquid.
16 It's going to come off just as a liquid so it never
17 goes through that air stream. So we were at 99
18 percent before. We'll probably still have about 1
19 percent of our air stream going up, but that will be
20 less than 1 percent of the total volume removed.

21 MRS. KAUPP: Do you know how that would be
22 measured like pounds in the air VOCs?

23 MR. MACH: The last time we did this and we
24 did the calculations for how many emission reduction
25 credits we'd need to buy, we looked at possibly up

1 to 9 tons per year. When we actually operated the
2 system, we emitted less than 1 ton per year. So we
3 had told you up front that the calculations were
4 very conservative and we showed that they were. And
5 I can get the exact number of what we emitted over
6 the entire operation of the system if you'd like to
7 see that.

8 MS. FIELD: Is this less or more volume?

9 MR. MACH: This is more volume being removed,
10 but we've emitted less volume than we've
11 anticipated.

12 MS. FIELD: So you haven't made any
13 calculations about the chemicals in the ones that
14 you removed?

15 MR. MACH: We are doing a revised health risk
16 assessment as part of this project with the new
17 parameters. When we did the initial health risk
18 assessment three years ago, we had shown that even
19 if we emitted the 9 tons, it would be less than 1 in
20 a million risk. We only emitted less than 1 ton, so
21 essentially our risk is probably more like 1 in 10
22 million as opposed to 1 in a million.

23 Any time any of the constituents change
24 or the ratio of constituents change by more than 10
25 percent, we were required to revise the HRA, which

1 we did. So because this process will be different,
2 we're doing a revision to the HRA as well, and we'll
3 use the data from the pilot test to come up with the
4 exact numbers.

5 MRS. KAUPP: And is this the only site where
6 VOCs are being emitted? Are there any other
7 exercises on the base that are emitting VOCs and is
8 there a cumulative report?

9 MR. MACH: There are no other remediation
10 systems on North Island right now that are emitting
11 VOCs. And as for compliance, there are paint spray
12 booths and other activities on the base that may
13 emit VOCs, and those are covered under the Assembly
14 Bill 2588 and the air toxics requirements.

15 MRS. KAUPP: Is there any way to get a
16 cumulative report?

17 MR. MACH: They do a cumulative report every
18 two or every four years. I think they do an air
19 toxics inventory report every two years, and then
20 the other two years from there they do the health
21 risk assessment based on the air toxics results from
22 two years ago. And they look at the entire base,
23 and they also include our remediation stuff in their
24 toxics report.

25 MR. COLLINS: We've got to move on.

1 MS. FIELD: Just one question. Are you going
2 to be doing -- when you do that revised HRA, are you
3 going to be coming back here and reporting on that
4 before you start the vapor extraction?

5 MR. MACH: That will be part of the work
6 plan.

7 MR. COLLINS: The next portion of the meeting
8 is going to cover a large document that we're
9 working on right now. It's the interim measures
10 assessment/current conditions report, and what it
11 does is evaluate all of the areas on the island
12 where we have reason to believe that there may be
13 some hazardous waste that was dumped in the past.
14 It's all the colored areas, IR sites.

15 One of the reports that was discussed in
16 the Corrective Action Order that was issued was --
17 and it's also in the FFSRA, too -- is an interim
18 measures assessment. Normally you're used to
19 dealing with things like work plans for cleaning up
20 hazardous waste sites and reading final reports and
21 things like that or health and safety plans. This is
22 another type of document.

23 And what this document does is help you
24 evaluate where wastes may have been disposed, get a
25 feel for them and decide is there a reason right now

1 to go out and do something in a hurry or plan on a
2 cleanup in a hurry rather than waiting years from
3 now to do something?

4 And also it gives you the current
5 condition of each site. So you have something then
6 to work with when you're developing your plan for
7 the cleanup of the island overall for any base
8 that's using this particular plan.

9 It starts with way back -- everything
10 starts, it seems like, with the permit. The
11 hazardous waste facility permit was issued to North
12 Island originally December 1989 and was renewed in
13 April 1, 1998. That's when the new permit became
14 effective, and it itself is good for ten years.

15 The Installation Restoration Program is
16 something that the Navy runs to clean up its
17 hazardous waste messes. It's basically governed by
18 CERCLA and by SARA. It's also in many ways governed
19 by the Resource Conservation Recovery Act or RCRA.

20 In 1989 the state conducted --

21 MS. FIELD: One quick question. The SARA is
22 a Superfund amendment?

23 MR. COLLINS: Superfund Amendments and
24 Reauthorization Act.

25 MS. FIELD: Is this a Superfund site? I

1 thought we said it wasn't.

2 MR. COLLINS: Congress decided that military
3 installations would follow the same rules as the
4 Superfund sites.

5 MS. FIELD: I see.

6 MR. COLLINS: Before that, we could wing it.
7 We could have our own program that was somewhat
8 similar, but we didn't have to comply with the same
9 law. Congress decided we should.

10 When DTSC conducted the RCRA Facility
11 Assessment, what they found was 81 solid waste
12 management units. We call them SWMUs, and three
13 areas of concern. RCRA Corrective Action, remember
14 that's a term or a requirement that's in the permit
15 to clean up these sites. Actually, it's investigate
16 them and then clean them up. If they're not dirty,
17 you don't have to clean them up.

18 We've spoken about the Corrective Action
19 Order. Once again, it incorporates the Corrective
20 Action requirements. And the Federal Facility Site
21 Remediation Agreement, which you had earlier this
22 evening, incorporated those requirements also.

23 Another program that we have had in the
24 Navy for quite a while is the underground storage
25 tank program. There are two phases here, one of

1 which we will discuss at RAB meetings in the future
2 and one of which we won't.

3 The petroleum product tanks like your
4 gasoline station tanks and your fuel oil tanks that
5 might be outside of barracks or something like that,
6 product tanks are not covered by this portion of
7 RCRA, and they're not funded really by our ERN
8 budget.

9 These are some of the tanks that are
10 affected by that, and we have some other old
11 petroleum tanks that were abandoned years ago that
12 have been taken out of the ground and we're cleaning
13 up the sites. And while ERN pays for that, the
14 Regional Water Quality Control Board manages or
15 provides oversight for those particular tanks.

16 The group of tanks that will become part
17 of our program from here on out until it's over with
18 are the hazardous waste and hazardous constituent
19 tanks. In many cases the Regional Water Quality
20 Control Board has been providing oversight for those
21 and providing advice to DTSC. DTSC has the ultimate
22 authority for them, but the Water Board has been
23 providing a lot of help.

24 Now, over time we've added solid waste
25 management units, SWMUs, to the list of what's out

1 at North Island. At this time we're up to 140.

2 Now, we've developed a strategy for
3 trying to decide what group to put these in so that
4 we could better understand them and tell the story
5 in the IMA/CCR, another acronym you need to learn
6 and remember.

7 There were objectives to the report:
8 Evaluate the current condition of each SWMU and AOC,
9 and conduct an interim measures assessment for each
10 SWMU and AOC. Moving along.

11 Is there any way to go call up that flow
12 chart? You have a flow chart in your report, the
13 third page. It's actually easier to read on your
14 personal copy.

15 So what we've done is take a look at the
16 SWMU and then decide is it already an IR site, and
17 if it is, it's moved over to the side, and we'll
18 investigate it in that program. If it isn't, if it
19 moves down and you can see -- well, is it an
20 underground storage tank. If it is, it goes off to
21 Group B. The ones where it's no, you move down the
22 chart, and we say, "Well, is it a SWMU or an AOC?
23 Is it part of the hazardous waste facility? What the
24 Navy in the past has sometimes called Green Acres
25 out in the middle of the island. We've taken a tour

1 out there at the Industrial Waste Treatment Plant.
2 If it's part of that, it went off to Group C. No?
3 It moved down.

4 Well, was it part of this waste
5 transport system? Well, there are the pipelines
6 that used to deliver the waste to the industrial
7 waste treatment plant and the oily waste treatment
8 plant and the pumping stations. If it fits that
9 category, it goes to that group. If not, well, does
10 it currently generate hazardous waste or does it
11 contain a hazardous waste? In this group we're
12 splitting hairs toward the end. If it is, it goes
13 off to another group. If it's no, then we look at
14 currently and not currently.

15 And then we finally come down to our
16 last group here, previous waste generators. Now we
17 can go back to the regular part.

18 We had an environmental study slide
19 here, and everybody knows that Naval Air Station
20 North Island is in San Diego County, portions of it
21 in the City of Coronado, some of it is in the City
22 of San Diego, around the shoreline especially. And
23 our operations really we run an airport. We have
24 aircraft maintenance facilities, and we homeport two
25 aircraft carriers.

1 Our environmental setting. You know we
2 have the surface water, but most of ours is either
3 the Pacific Ocean or San Diego Bay, and we have two
4 little sloughs and five golf course ponds.

5 Our geology is rather simple -- man-made
6 fill areas and their main formation is the sandy
7 soil that are natural right here. And our
8 groundwater hydrology is 0 to 25 feet to the
9 groundwater, depending on how close to the beach you
10 are. And there's no beneficial use. If the water
11 was clean and had no extra chemicals in it from us,
12 it would still taste pretty nasty. It would be
13 unusable.

14 We're going to go through these pretty
15 quick, but Group A included 11 of the IR sites,
16 actually -- Site 11 is included somewhere else --
17 and one AOC.

18 Group B, once again, is the underground
19 storage tanks. Out at the fuel farm we have seven
20 SWMUs out there that we're taking care of. Then we
21 have another group of 22 SWMUs. They've actually
22 been closed and we have no further action
23 concurrence from either the Water Board or the
24 County. So in their opinion there's nothing left
25 for us to do. We'll run these by DTSC to get their

1 concurrence.

2 We have another group of 14 SWMUs. We've
3 recommended closure and no further action
4 concurrence, and we're in the process of waiting for
5 them to tell us yea or nay.

6 And then we have another group of nine
7 SWMUs with ongoing or recommended site assessment.
8 And these are scattered all over the island.

9 MR. McCAULEY: Any idea on how many of those
10 SWMUs with a no further action, how many of those
11 SWMUs have chlorinated solvent contamination?

12 MR. COLLINS: No. There were about nine that
13 NADEP operated like that, and then there's another
14 group -- those had hazardous waste. And then there
15 were a smaller group of six or seven more that had
16 hazardous constituents like pure product TCE or
17 something and they had leaked out.

18 In Group C -- now we're out at the
19 Industrial Waste Treatment Plant -- and out here you
20 have basically IR Site 11 which consists of two
21 SWMUs, surface impoundments with SWMUs 11 and 81.
22 And then you have the old Industrial Waste Treatment
23 Plant, non-surface impoundments. The OWTP, the Oily
24 Waste non-surface impoundments. We have ancillary
25 pipelines running from here to there with them. A

1 lot of those were removed this summer or this fall
2 and this spring.

3 We have the CST, which is the Collection
4 Storage Transfer Facility. That's in the same
5 compound, and then off site from here there's
6 another area where PCBs were stored, and that's also
7 been closed. Torn down.

8 Group D involved the pipelines and the
9 pump stations. Like I said, some of this waste had
10 to get to the treatment plant one way or another.
11 Some buildings produced so much waste in the past
12 that it was just piped; others, it was trucked.

13 So this group is the section where we
14 had the pipelines, approximately 35 miles of
15 pipeline. We don't have that on GIS yet, so I can't
16 really show you how baffling it is, but it's a maze
17 that goes everywhere, and that will be probably our
18 biggest mess to clean up on the island, area wise
19 anyway.

20 Now we have the current waste
21 generators. A lot of these particular SWMUs either
22 had the waste formerly piped -- nobody has their
23 waste piped anymore. Pipelines have been either
24 abandoned or reconverted and turned into non-
25 industrial waste pipelines. So what we have here,

1 though, is a group where it was formerly piped or
2 formerly trucked, and then we have a few current
3 source areas that are in there.

4 Everybody is still basically operating;
5 whether or not they're generating waste is another
6 story or what kind of waste.

7 I suspect that many of these solid waste
8 management units won't shut down for more than 50
9 years, so how we attack these sites is another
10 story. These become more difficult, since they're
11 actually factory buildings.

12 These are the previous waste generators.
13 Some of these buildings actually used to generate
14 the waste. They no longer do. They no longer
15 generate any waste at all, whether it was piped or
16 trucked, and then some older source areas.

17 That's it. This report will be coming
18 out. Our intention is to have it out next week.
19 Certainly you will have it by June 3rd, I would say.
20 You'll have it in your hands. And it's only about
21 three inches thick, double sided. There are several
22 maps in there.

23 It is interesting because it talks about
24 all of the SWMUs -- all 140. If you want to know
25 something about part of the base, you can find it on

1 there and read the report, and it will tell you what
2 we know, basically what we found and what we plan to
3 do next. It's a handy report to plan with.

4 We will incorporate that as an
5 attachment to our Site Management Plan where we then
6 take risks and budget and work out a plan for
7 cleaning up the base. And this will be the bulk of
8 the data that's used to explain why we want to do it
9 this way, and that's it. And we're almost out of
10 time.

11 We can move on to one minute of the
12 Community Relations Plan. The Community Relations
13 plan was finalized. I believe we put it in the mail
14 on May 3rd, at least that's when I signed the
15 letter, and you should have either gotten a hard
16 copy of the report -- it's only about an inch thick
17 -- or you got a CD-ROM version. We mailed a copy to
18 every member of the RAB. I believe we sent out 30
19 copies of the CD and 15 copies of the hard report.

20 So has anybody looked at it? Was it
21 worthwhile to send or is it just sitting on a shelf?
22 Did you have difficulties reading it?

23 If you don't want to get reports like
24 this in the mail, either hard copy or CD, you need
25 to let us know. Otherwise, we're going to continue

1 to generate them and share them with you. As RAB
2 members, you have the option of reading it. I think
3 really as RAB members, you're supposed to have the
4 responsibility and obligation a read these reports,
5 but I'll leave that up to you. We don't have an
6 agreement with you where we can penalize you if you
7 don't.

8 That's it for the Community Relations.

9 And the next thing we need to talk about
10 --

11 MR. MACH: While we're on Community Relations
12 -- I just stole one minute of time -- I don't know
13 if you guys have been in the library recently and
14 taken a look at the Information Repository and the
15 documents here.

16 We've done a lot of work over the last
17 two months. We've moved all the documents on to two
18 new shelves which are underneath that sand sculpture
19 against the wall. All the binders are color coded
20 now, so all the blue binders are the general
21 documents. The Navy's IR manual; the Navy's OPNAV
22 5090.1b, which is a document that we have to abide
23 by; CERCLA, RCRA, a whole bunch of EPA guidance
24 documents that's all up in the left in blue.

25 Up on the right in red are all the

1 documents that Sandor had recommended that are out
2 for review. It's kind of a 90-day look ahead of all
3 the documents, kind of the hot topics. So that's
4 why they're in red. It's also got the guidance
5 document, how to find documents within this and the
6 user's guide for the entire thing.

7 Then we've got in orange or yellow,
8 we've got the documents that go to NAB; and then
9 we've got all the North Island documents in order by
10 site. And if you look like in the index, if you
11 went to Site 9, we did that Site 2 and 9 removal
12 action. It will say such and such a document -- it
13 will say Site 2 and 9 work plan filed under Site 2,
14 so you know to go to Site 2 to find that document so
15 we don't have to have two copies of it.

16 So I think we took into account most all
17 of your comments, and hopefully you guys will have a
18 chance to take a look at it and let us know what you
19 think.

20 And with all the new documents coming
21 out in CD-ROM, John Locke is working hard on getting
22 a Navy computer, an excessed computer that we're
23 going to be putting in the library. We've got
24 Bechtel buying a separate desk, and we're going to
25 have a desk there with a computer with a CD-ROM

1 drive so you can come in here and just run the CDs
2 here. And the CDs, were getting a little holder to
3 put all the CDs into, and they're going to have
4 little small metallic strip so you don't walk away
5 with them.

6 MS. PARKER: Richard, can I just emphasize
7 that if people use the library, that they do sign in
8 because it will be very helpful to us to find out if
9 the library is set up in a meaningful way and if
10 there's any revisions you'd like to see.

11 MR. MACH: Right. The sign-in sheet is in
12 the user's guide so if you'd do that, that would be
13 great.

14 MR. COLLINS: Okay. One more.

15 MRS. KAUPP: That's neat that you did that,
16 color coded. Is there any possibility of having a
17 large map that shows each of sites mounted on the
18 wall?

19 MR. MACH: I think it would be very difficult
20 to get the library to agree to that. The library
21 director is a little upset with us that we --
22 there's not enough room in the library, for one
23 thing, and that sand sculpture was donated by
24 someone and he doesn't want to put another computer
25 underneath it. They went a little ballistic when we

1 told them we'll move the current computer and you'll
2 have to find someplace else for it, and we'll put
3 our computer here. So I don't think they're going
4 to allow a map.

5 However, the IMA/CCR report that Bill
6 just talked about has a whole bunch of D size
7 drawings in it, which will show all the sites in
8 color. So if you remember IMA/CCR, that is your
9 one-stop shopping. You'll see the current condition
10 of all of the sites, and the maps in there are very
11 good.

12 MS. FARGO: I think a map would be helpful.
13 Maybe we can get a smaller map, but I think that
14 would be worth pursuing.

15 MR. COLLINS: Their sand sculpture is
16 important.

17 MS. FARGO: I understand.

18 MR. COLLINS: Moving along, we need to --
19 we're about out of time, but are there any other
20 public comments, questions or answers? And we need
21 to come up with the topics for the next meeting
22 also; and then we want to talk about possibly moving
23 the November RAB meeting, and we have about two
24 minutes for each.

25 MS. FARGO: I want to thank Debbie for doing

1 an update of the list, and I want everybody that
2 communicates with me to know that I have a new
3 e-mail address of my own. It's my initials and my
4 name, cjfargo -- so please, Bill, communicate with
5 me that way -- aol.com.

6 MR. COLLINS: Any topics? What would you
7 like to hear about next month? Now, realizing --
8 that's June. Do we need an update on Site 9 again?

9 MR. MACH: I'll give a quick five-minute
10 update on Site 9.

11 MS. FARGO: What other sites are active and
12 we haven't heard about?

13 MR. COLLINS: We'll be able to -- if you're
14 reading the IMA/CCR, we might be able to talk about
15 it a little bit and see what you think about it.

16 MR. BONSAVAGE: I want to do a San Diego Bay
17 munitions update.

18 MR. COLLINS: Okay. San Diego Bay munitions.

19 MR. MACH: And Site 10 Draft RI Report does
20 come out about that time, too.

21 MR. BONSAVAGE: Hopefully. I don't know.

22 MR. COLLINS: We'll wait on that.

23 MR. McCAULEY: What about the Amphib base?

24 MR. BONSAVAGE: And we've got the ESI. It's
25 coming out.

1 MR. COLLINS: That's the extended site
2 inspection. That's a start.

3 One thing that's come up is in November
4 our reporter, Nancy, is going to be on vacation, and
5 we have the option of having an alternate come in
6 and work with us or possibly moving the meeting to
7 the first week of December. The 1st and 2nd are both
8 available.

9 MS. WANKIER: But the librarian in there
10 right now wasn't 100 percent positive if it's still
11 -- she's not in charge of that. But she looked on
12 the calendar and nothing's posted, so more than
13 likely it is available, both for the 1st and 2nd of
14 December.

15 MS. FARGO: That would be about six weeks
16 from October 21st to December 1st or 2nd.

17 MR. COLLINS: Correct.

18 MR. MACH: We normally skip December anyway,
19 so that's going to shorten the duration between the
20 January meeting.

21 MR. COLLINS: We don't really lose anything.
22 Is that agreeable?

23 MS. FARGO: What's the first choice, what
24 date, and what's the second choice?

25 MR. COLLINS: I prefer Wednesday, the 1st.

1 MR. MACH: Let's set it for Wednesday, and if
2 for any reason there's a conflict, then we'll go for
3 the 2nd, and we'll let you know for sure.

4 MR. COLLINS: Okay.

5 MS. FARGO: One other thing, John, thank you
6 for doing such a great job getting the announcement
7 in "The Eagle." I saw it a week ago yesterday, a
8 nice blurb, and I did see it on the calendar
9 yesterday, so thank you.

10 I wanted to comment on the minutes.
11 Unfortunately, I did spend a considerable amount of
12 time going through those. I apologize that I just
13 don't have them with me.

14 MR. COLLINS: Okay. Next month we will
15 approve April's minutes.

16 MS. FARGO: Can we put them off that long?
17 Will anyone object to that?

18 MR. MACH: And also, if you can get me your
19 comments before then, we can go ahead and revise
20 them and send out the revised minutes again for
21 everyone to see what comments you've made.

22 MS. FARGO: Okay.

23 MR. LOCKE: The other approval was just for
24 March 31st?

25 MR. MACH: Right.

1 MR. COLLINS: I don't think anybody's heart
2 will stop about a couple more months. We can handle
3 it.

4 MS. FARGO: Thank you. I appreciate that.

5 MR. COLLINS: Thank you. (Whereupon, at 8:25
6 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA,)

2 : ss.

3 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO.)

4
5
6
7 I, Nancy A. Lee, CSR No. 3870, hereby certify
8 that I reported in shorthand the above proceedings,
9 on Thursday, May 20, 1999, at 640 Orange Avenue,
10 Winn Room, in the City of Coronado, County of San
11 Diego, State of California; and I do further certify
12 that the above and foregoing pages, numbered from 1
13 to 82, inclusive, contain a true and correct
14 transcript of all of said proceedings.

15 DATED: _____, 1999.

16
17
18
19
20 _____

21 Nancy A. Lee